# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA WESTERN DIVISION

JOHN KITTERMAN,	)
Plaintiff,	) ) ) Civ. No. 21-5039
V.	)
FARMINGTON CASUALTY COMPANY (TRAVELERS INSURANCE), and THE HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,	) ) COMPLAINT ) )
Defendants.	)
	)
	)

Comes now the Plaintiff, John Kitterman, by and through his attorneys of record, and for his Complaint and cause of action against the above-named Defendants, states and alleges as follows:

## **PARTIES**

- 1. Plaintiff John Kitterman ("Kitterman") is a resident of Wall, South Dakota.
- 2. Defendant Farmington Casualty Company/Travelers Insurance ("Travelers") is domiciled in the State of Connecticut and doing business in the State of South Dakota.
- 3. Defendant The Hartford Fire Insurance Company ("Hartford") is domiciled in the State of Connecticut and doing business in the State of South Dakota.
- 4. The circumstances which are the subject matter of this Complaint occurred in the State of South Dakota, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of costs and interest.
- 5. Jurisdiction is proper based upon diversity of citizenship pursuant to 28 U.S.C.§ 1332.

- 6. At all times material herein, Kitterman was employed by Golden West Telecommunications ("Employer").
- 7. At all times material herein, either of the Defendants Travelers and Hartford were the workers' compensation insurer for Employer.
- 8. At all times material herein, all Defendants had a duty under South Dakota law to ensure and provide workers' compensation benefits to injured employees and to ensure these benefits are timely provided.

#### **FACTS**

- The Employer was insured under the Worker's Compensation Laws of the State of South Dakota at all times relevant hereto.
- Prior to January 1, 2016, Employer had a workers' compensation insurance policy with Hartford.
- 11. From January 1, 2016, to at least December 31, 2016, Employer had a workers' compensation insurance policy with Travelers.
- 12. On January 11, 2016, Kitterman reported discomfort in his right wrist to Employer's Human Resources assistant.
- 13. Employer's Human Resources assistant informed Kitterman that she would fill out a First Report of Injury that day, January 11, 2016.
- 14. Kitterman sought medical treatment for his right wrist.
- 15. Kitterman was diagnosed with carpal tunnel syndrome on January 28, 2016.
- 16. On May 19, 2016, Dr. David Lang, Kitterman's treating medical provider opined that Kitterman's carpal tunnel syndrome was causally related to his employment, mentioning his long career doing a lot of wire handling with gripping, squeezing, and grasping.

- 17. Kitterman's employment with Employer was a major contributing cause of his carpal tunnel injury and need for treatment.
- 18. Kitterman timely provided Employer with actual and written notice of the work-related injury.
- 19. Kitterman required medical care and treatment as a result of his carpal tunnel injury.
- 20. Kitterman incurred medical care expenses and treatment expenses as a result of his carpal tunnel injury.
- 21. At the time of reporting the injury, Travelers was the workers' compensation insurer.
- 22. Under SDCL 62-7-38, Travelers was required to "make *immediate* payment of the claim *until* all ... insurers agree on responsibility or the matter is appropriately adjudicated by the Department of Labor and Regulation..." (emphasis added).
- 23. The duties under SDCL 62-7-38 are clear and not fairly debatable.
- 24. Travelers did not follow the requirements of SDCL 62-7-38 by making immediate payment of the claim.
- 25. Instead, both insurance companies denied Kitterman's claim for medical benefits.
- 26. On April 28, 2016, Travelers denied Kitterman's claim for workers' compensation benefits.
- 27. Travelers failed to adequately investigate the claim.
- 28. Travelers' denial was without a reasonable basis or cause.
- 29. Travelers knew the denial was without a reasonable basis or cause, or recklessly disregarded the information it had when making the denial.
- 30. Travelers asserted a basis for denial to avoid paying the claim, which Travelers knew had no factual or legal basis.
- 31. Travelers unreasonably failed to reconsider its denial when presented with new information regarding the claim.

- 32. On July 14, 2016, Hartford denied Kitterman's claim for workers' compensation benefits.
- 33. Hartford failed to adequately investigate the claim.
- 34. Hartford's denial was without a reasonable basis or cause.
- 35. The Hartford knew the denial was without a reasonable basis or cause, or recklessly disregarded the information it had when making the denial.
- 36. The Hartford asserted a basis for denial to avoid paying the claim, which the Hartford knew had no factual or legal merit.
- 37. The Hartford failed to reconsider its denial when presented with new information, in bad faith.
- 38. Travelers and Hartford did not agree on responsibility for Kitterman's work injury.
- 39. Travelers and Hartford did not seek to have the matter appropriately adjudicated by the Department of Labor and Regulation.
- 40. Because both insurers denied, Kitterman's workers' compensation benefits were not paid by any workers' compensation insurer.
- 41. The insurers violated their legal duties to provide or pay for Kitterman's medical care.
- 42. As a result of these denials, Kitterman brought these matters to the South Dakota Department of Labor ("Department") for determination of responsibility of the insurers.
- 43. The Hartford and Travelers continued to deny the claim.
- 44. Kitterman's case was litigated extensively from 2016 through 2019.
- 45. Defendant Travelers submitted the medical opinion of Dr. Bruce Elkins on December 27, 2017.
- 46. Dr. Elkins' report was limited to the question of whether the injury was caused by work over an 11-day period, from January 1, 2016 to January 11, 2016.
- 47. Dr. Elkins opined that the carpal tunnel condition was "present/ongoing prior to January

2016."

- 48. Defendant Travelers requested that Plaintiff attend an IME with Dr. Elkins on January 18, 2018.
- 49. Plaintiff attended the evaluation and the results were unchanged from the previous opinion.
- 50. Dr. Elkins' opinion did not contradict Dr. Lang's opinion.
- 51. Defendant Hartford also denied Plaintiff's claims for benefits, on the basis of Dr. Elkins' opinions, even though his opinion did not support Defendant Hartford.
- 52. In August 2018, the Department determined that Travelers was not ultimately responsible for the medical care.
- 53. Despite the clear requirements of SDCL 62-7-38, Travelers had not paid for Kitterman's workers' compensation benefits up to that time.
- 54. Travelers unreasonably delayed and denied payment of Kitterman's workers' compensation claim during the pendency of Travelers' efforts to avoid liability.
- 55. Travelers knew there was no basis to deny payment under SDCL 62-7-38, but fabricated excuses to avoid payments under this statute during the pendency of the resolution of the claim.
- 56. Rather than paying for benefits and contesting its obligation to do so, Travelers shifted the burdens of litigation to Kitterman, forcing him to litigation, rather than proceeding under the statutory procedures which required suit between the insurers, with all associated costs, time, and stress.
- 57. The Hartford still failed to pay benefits for Kitterman's workers' compensation injury.
- 58. No hearing was held before the Department of Labor.
- 59. The Hartford presented no evidence that the workers' compensation claim was not

compensable.

- 60. The Hartford obtained no expert opinions to support its position, but instead unreasonably relied on the opinions of Travelers' expert witness, whose opinion did not support Hartford's position.
- 61. The Hartford unreasonably delayed and denied Kitterman's workers' compensation claim.
- 62. The Hartford knew there was no basis to deny Claimant's benefits, but fabricated excuses to avoid payment.
- 63. Defendants harassed and wasted Plaintiff's time with unnecessary legal proceedings and evaluations, in an effort to avoid admitting the compensability of the claim and to cover up or excuse their bad faith denials.
- 64. Plaintiff was required to take time off of work to address these matters.
- 65. On February 14, 2019, the Department entered its Memorandum Decision ("2019 Decision").
- 66. The 2019 Decision definitively concludes that Kitterman provided notice to Employer and Hartford in accordance with SDCL § 62-7-10, and that Kitterman's work-related activities were a major contributing cause of his condition. *Id*.
- 67. The 2019 Decision was confirmed by an Order signed by Judge Faw on April 23, 2019 ("Order of the Department"):

"ORDERED that John Kitterman ... has established by a preponderance of the evidence his entitlement to workers' compensation benefits for his right hand/carpal tunnel injury, pursuant to SDCL Title 62, and it is further

ORDERED that the Employer and Insurer [Golden West Telecommunications and The Hartford Fire Insurance Company] shall pay for Claimant's workers' compensation medical benefits, established in the amount of \$10,046.66, plus interest in the amount of \$2,296.84, as of September 19, 2018, plus interest in the amount of \$2.84 per day after that date."

#### **COUNT I – BAD FAITH**

- 68. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 67 above, inclusive, and they are specifically incorporated by reference, as if set out in full herein.
- 69. Defendants unreasonably denied and delayed providing medical worker's compensation benefits to Kitterman, as required by law and contract.
- 70. Defendants knew or should have known that they, individually or collectively, had no reasonable basis to deny Kitterman's worker's compensation benefits.
- 71. Defendants failed to perform a reasonable and good faith investigation before denying or unreasonably delaying Kitterman's workers' compensation benefits, forcing him to file litigation and bring it to conclusion.
- 72. Defendants knew or should have known that there was no reasonable basis to deny Kitterman's medical workers' compensation benefits, or were recklessly indifferent to, or recklessly disregarded, the facts and proofs submitted or known to them when they withheld, denied, or delayed such workers' compensation benefits.
- 73. Defendant Travelers had no basis to deny workers compensation benefits under SDCL 62-7-38.
- 74. The plain language of SDCL 62-7-38 is not fairly debatable.
- 75. Defendant Travelers knew it had no basis to deny workers compensation benefits under SDCL 62-7-38.
- 76. Defendant Hartford denied workers' compensation benefits to Kitterman, without a reasonable basis.
- 77. Defendant Hartford failed to reasonably investigate Kitterman's claim and/or recklessly disregarded the evidence and proofs that were submitted.

- 78. Defendant Hartford knew it had no basis to deny Kitterman's workers' compensation claim.
- 79. Kitterman suffered unnecessary waste of time and use of sick leave, frustration, mental suffering, and other damages as a result of the Defendants' failure to pay his workers' compensation claim.
- 80. Defendants have otherwise breached its duty of good faith and fair dealing with Kitterman.

## **COUNT II - CONVERSION**

- 81. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 80 above, inclusive, and they are specifically incorporated by reference, as if set out in full herein.
- 82. Defendants exerted unauthorized control or dominion over the property of Kitterman, by the above-described actions, in a way that rejected and denied Kitterman's right to these funds, or in a manner inconsistent with Kitterman's rights.
- 83. Kitterman has an interest in the funds required to pay for his medical care and treatment.
- 84. Kitterman's interest in the funds is superior to Defendants'.
- 85. Defendants exerted dominion or control over, or seriously interfered with, Kitterman's interest in these funds.
- 86. Defendants converted the reasonable value of the medical care and services ordered by the treating physician. In addition, Kitterman suffered unnecessary waste of time and sick leave, frustration, mental suffering, and other damages as a result of the Defendants' failure to pay his workers' compensation claim and requiring him to proceed through litigation.

# EXEMPLARY AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES

- 87. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1 through 86 above, inclusive, and they are specifically incorporated by reference, as if set out in full herein.
- 88. As a result of Defendants' actions, Kitterman has endured delay and obstruction of the

payment for his medical care and loss of use of his benefits.

89. Defendants acted with malice, oppression, and deliberate and reckless disregard for the rights

of Kitterman.

90. Defendants acted in a willful and wanton disregard of the legal duties imposed on them and

the rights of Kitterman.

91. The payment of workers' compensation benefits owed is insufficient to ensure that bad faith

practices are not employed in the future.

92. Kitterman is entitled to an award of exemplary and punitive damages as the only way to deter

workers' compensation insurers from continuing to employ the same methods against other

injured employees and to punish Defendants for their tortious acts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff requests an award of compensatory damages, including both

economic and non-economic losses, exemplary and punitive damages, prejudgment interest as

allowed by law, attorney's fees and costs, and such other further relief as the court or jury deems

appropriate, necessary, just, and equitable under the circumstances.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2021.

BY:

David S Barar

GOODSELL & OVIATT, LLP

246 Founders Park Dr., Suite 201

P.O. Box 9249

Rapid City, SD 57709-9249

Tel: (605) 343-3000

Fax: (605) 343-3251

Attorneys for Plaintiff

TRIAL BY JURY IS HEREBY DEMANDED

David S. Barari

JS 44 (Rev. 04/21)

### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	10			DEFENDA	NTS						
JOHN KITTERMAN			FARMINGTON CASUALTY COMPANY (TRAVELERS INSURANCE), and THE HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY								
(b) County of Residence of	(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff PENNINGTON			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant							
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.								
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, A	Addward and Talanhava Numba	.wl		Attorneys (If Kn		i Dilito ii	TOD TEE.				
	Goodsell + Oviatt, L			7 Recincys (2) IX	.01711						
PO Box 9249, R	apid City, SD 57709	)	_								
(605) 343-3000	TOTAL TOTAL		E CT	PIZENCIUS O	E DD	INICITE A	T DADDIES				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ECTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)	III. CI	TIZENSHIP O (For Diversity Cases (		INCIPA		Place an "X" in and One Box for I			
U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government i	Not a Party)	Citiz	en of This State	PTF X 1		Incorporated or Pri of Business In T		PTF 4	<b>DEF</b> 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	X 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)	Citiz	en of Another State	2	_ 2	Incorporated and F of Business In A		5	<b>X</b> 5	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3	<u> </u>	Foreign Nation		<u> </u>	6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		a, col I-ios	Click here for: Nature of				Suit Code Descriptions. OTHER STATUTES				
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	RTS PERSONAL INJUR		ORFEITURE/PENAL  5 Drug Related Seizur			IKRUPTCY neal 28 USC 158	375 False (			
120 Marine 130 Miller Act	310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product	365 Personal Injury - Product Liability		of Property 21 USC 881		423 Withdrawal		376 Qui Tam (31 USC			
140 Negotiable Instrument	Liability	367 Health Care/	690 Other			28 USC 157 3729(a INTELLECTUAL 400 State R			eapportion	eapportionment	
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	Pharmaceutical Personal Injury			F	PROPI	ERTY RIGHTS	410 Antitri 430 Banks		ng	
151 Medicare Act	330 Federal Employers'	Product Liability	,			830 Pate	ent	450 Comm	erce		
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability 340 Marine	Injury Product			L	835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application   460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influer					
(Excludes Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	345 Marine Product Liability	Liability PERSONAL PROPER	rv cos	LABOR	1000	340 Trae	demark	Corrup 480 Consu	t Organiza mer Credit		
of Veteran's Benefits	350 Motor Vehicle	370 Other Fraud	71	710 Fair Labor Standards		Act of 2016 (15 USC 168			SC 1681 o	r 1692)	
160 Stockholders' Suits	355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal	Act 720 Labor/Management		. [	485 Telephone Consumer SOCIAL SECURITY Protection Act			ımer		
195 Contract Product Liability	X 360 Other Personal	Property Damage		Relations		861 HIA (1395ff) 490 Cable/Sat TV				diei/	
196 Franchise	Injury 362 Personal Injury -	385 Property Damage Product Liability		10 Railway Labor Act 51 Family and Medical	. [	863 DIV	ck Lung (923) VC/DIWW (405(g))	Excha	nge		
REAL PROPERTY	Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS / 79	Leave Act Other Labor Litigati	ion L	=	D Title XVI [ (405(g))	890 Other 8			
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights	Habeas Corpus:		791 Employee Retirement			1077	893 Environmental Matters			
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 442 Employment	463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate	e	Income Security Act	it [		AL TAX SUITS  es (U.S. Plaintiff	895 Freedo Act	m of Infor	mation	
240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability	443 Housing/ Accommodations	Sentence 530 General			-		Defendant) —Third Party	896 Arbitra		rocedure	
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities -		lest.	IMMIGRATION			USC 7609	899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of			
	Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth		52 Naturalization Appli 55 Other Immigration	ication			Agency 950 Consti	y Decision tutionality	of	
	Other 448 Education	550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition		Actions				State S			
	1440 Education	560 Civil Detainee -									
	<u> </u>	Conditions of Confinement									
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" i		~		5.00			Z 3 Z 1011 v		26.10.10		
		Remanded from [ Appellate Court	4 Rein Reo	pened 🗀 A:	ransferr Inother I I <i>pecify)</i>		6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer	1 1	Multidis Litigatio Direct I	on -	
	Cite the U.S. Civil Sta 28 USC 1332	atute under which you a	re filing (	Do not cite jurisdiction	nal statut	tes unless di	iversity):				
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of ca Worker's comp insurar										
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	N D	EMAND \$			HECK YES only URY DEMAND:		n compla No		
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER											
DATE ( 7.7.7) / SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD											
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY											
	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		un.	) NGE	· -	MAG III	DGE			